

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is filed along with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in response to the final Office Action dated December 20, 2007. In that Office Action, Claims 1, 4, 9-19, 23, 26, 28, 50, 53, 56-65, 67-69, 74-78, 80-87, and 92-101 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2002/0152332 to Rensin et al. (“*Rensin*”) and U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2004/0093317 to Swan (“*Swan*”). In a previous response, Applicants canceled Claims 2-3, 5-8, 20-22, 24-25, 27, 29-49, 51-52, 54-55, 66, 70-73, 79, 88-91, and 102-120. For the Examiner’s reference, in this response, Applicants have canceled Claims 67, 74, 81, and 85-86, and have amended various claims. Following the amendments, Claims 1, 4, 9-19, 23, 26, 28, 50, 53, 56-65, 68-69, 75-78, 80, 82-84, 87, 92-101 remain pending in the application.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, Claims 1, 4, 9-19, 23, 26, 28, 50, 53, 56-65, 67-69, 74-78, 80-87, and 92-101 were rejected as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in light of U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2002/0152332 to Rensin et al. (“*Rensin*”) in view of U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2004/0093317 to Swan (“*Swan*”). Each of the claim rejections are addressed below.

Independent Claim 1

On Page 3 of the Office Action, independent Claim 1 has been rejected as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in light of *Rensin* in view of *Swan*. Although Applicants do not necessarily agree with the current rejection of Claim 1, in order to facilitate prosecution of the present application, Applicants have amended Claim 1 to further distinguish the claimed invention from the cited prior art. For example, Applicants have amended Claim 1 to specify a method performed with a computing device, the method comprising the steps of: (1) “**mapping one or more fields of contact data from personal information manager (PIM) software to one or more corresponding fields of a web page of a web application to produce mapping data;**” and (2) “**mapping data from one or more fields of the selected set of contact data to the one**

or more corresponding fields of the web page of the web application to automatically populate the web page by using the mapping data.” Support for the amendment is found in Paragraph [0018] of the specification.

Applicants note that *Rensin* describes a way for populating online forms using data records saved in a local database or data records saved in a favorites database comprising the user's favorite or most frequently used data records in filling out on-line forms. (See [0044] and [0049] and Fig. 5). For instance, a user launches a web site containing on-line forms. (See [0055]). The user may then proceed to select a data record saved in a local database in a handheld Internet appliance to fill out the corresponding destination address (i.e., field) on one of the on-line forms. (*Id.*).

Specifically, the user clicks on a button displayed on the web site for selecting a data record and this displays a menu containing items that may be selected by the user to fill the on-line form. (See [0056]). These items include individual data records or a request to get a data record in a local database of the handheld Internet appliance. (*Id.*).

If the user selects a data record from the menu, the data record is used to automatically fill in the address field on the on-line form. (See [0057]). In addition, the menu items will vary according to the type of the field to be filled in on the on-line form. (See [0058]). For instance, a field may request a data record indicating a name, an address, a date, a credit card number, among others. (*Id.*). Therefore, the type of data record requested depends on the particular field on the on-line form being filled out. For example, if the field to be populated is an address, the user will select the “Get address” item on the menu. (See [0059]). A listing of individual addresses (i.e., records) from a database will be displayed to the user and the user can select the particular address (i.e., record) to populate the address field on the on-line form. (See [0057] and [0059]).

This is further illustrated by the structure (i.e., fields) of the favorites database. The data fields of the favorites database correspond to: (1) a label displayed in the menu; (2) a pointer to a data record in a local database; (3) ***the type of the data record***; and (4) the data record selection. (See [0061]). (Emphasis added). Thus, the records in the database are distinguished by indicating the type of the data record to be entered into a given field on an on-line form. (*Id.*).

In contrast, the method of Claim 1 does not map a data *record* to a particular *field* on the on-line form. (Emphasis added). Instead, the method maps one or more *fields* of contact data to one or more corresponding *fields* of a web page. (Emphasis added). This provides two distinct advantages over *Rensin*.

First, various embodiments of Claim 1 provide more flexibility and more availability in searching the contact data from the PIM software. Since it is the fields of the contact data that are mapped to the corresponding fields of the web page instead of the records of the contact data, whenever a new contact is added to the PIM software (e.g., a new record is added to the PIM software) the new contact is automatically available for populating a web page. Furthermore, each field of the new contact (e.g., name, address, city, state, zip code, and country) is automatically available for populating the web page.

However, in *Rensin*, when a new record is added to a local database or a favorites database, the type of the record must first be defined in order for the record to become available to a user to populate an on-line form. In addition, a record can only be defined as one type and therefore can only be made available to populate a particular field on the on-line form as opposed a record being composed of several fields wherein each field of the new record can be used to populate a number of fields on the on-line form such as name, address, city, state, zip code, and country.

Second, various embodiments of Claim 1 allow for several fields on a web page to be populated automatically by selecting a single set of contact data (e.g., a single record) as opposed to having to select multiple records in order to populate multiple fields on the web page as is the case in *Rensin*. As mentioned, each record in *Rensin* corresponds to a particular type of data to fill the on-line form. (See [0057]-[0059]). Thus, if a user wants to populate several fields on the on-line form, the user will be required to select several records (moving from field to field, one at a time) in order to populate the fields. In contrast, a user utilizing various embodiments of Claim 1 only needs to select one set of contact data in order to map data from one or more fields of the selected set of contact data to the one or more corresponding fields of the web page to automatically populate the web page.

Thus, *Rensin* fails to disclose: (1) “**mapping one or more fields of contact data from**

personal information manager (PIM) software to one or more corresponding fields of a web page of a web application to produce mapping data;” and (2) “mapping data from one or more fields of the selected set of contact data to the one or more corresponding fields of the web page of the web application to automatically populate the web page by using the mapping data.”

In addition, *Swan* discloses a centralized system for maintaining and distributing contact information to multiple end users (e.g., personal computers or PDAs). (See [0013], [0053], [0062]-[0064], and [0081]). The centralized system can retrieve contact information, format the contact information based on the needs of the end user, and transmit the formatted contact information to the end user. (See [0081]). Therefore, *Rensin* and *Swan* teach away from each other and are not properly combinable because *Swan* is concerned with providing formatted contact data to multiple end users while *Rensin* is concerned with populating a particular field on a web page. Thus, *Swan* does not fulfill the deficiencies of *Rensin* and fails to disclose: (1) **“mapping one or more fields of contact data from personal information manager (PIM) software to one or more corresponding fields of a web page of a web application to produce mapping data;”** and (2) **“mapping data from one or more fields of the selected set of contact data to the one or more corresponding fields of the web page of the web application to automatically populate the web page by using the mapping data.”**

Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that *Rensin* and *Swan* fail to disclose or suggest a method performed with a computing device, the method comprising the steps of: (1) **“mapping one or more fields of contact data from personal information manager (PIM) software to one or more corresponding fields of a web page of a web application to produce mapping data;”** and (2) **“mapping data from one or more fields of the selected set of contact data to the one or more corresponding fields of the web page of the web application to automatically populate the web page by using the mapping data,”** as recited by independent Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection of independent Claim 1.

Independent Claim 19

On Page 5 of the Office Action, independent Claim 19 has been rejected as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in light of *Rensin* in view of *Swan*. Although Applicants do not necessarily agree with the current rejection of Claim 19, in order to facilitate prosecution of the present application, Applicants have amended Claim 19 to further distinguish the claimed invention from the cited prior art. For example, Applicants have amended Claim 19 to specify: (1) “**receiving mapping software for generating mapping data that maps at least one field of contact data from a personal information manager (PIM) software to at least one corresponding field of a web application;**” and (2) “**receiving interface software for automatically populating the web page of the web application with data from one or more fields of a selected set of contact data based on the mapping data generated by the mapping software.**” Support for the amendment is found in paragraph [0018] of the specification. Thus, for the reasons explained above in regard to Claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that *Rensin* and *Swan* fail to disclose or suggest these features and, accordingly, request that the current rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Independent Claim 26

On Page 5 of the Office Action, independent Claim 26 has been rejected as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in light of *Rensin* in view of *Swan*. Although Applicants do not necessarily agree with the current rejection of Claim 26, in order to facilitate prosecution of the present application, Applicants have amended Claim 26 to further distinguish the claimed invention from the cited prior art. For example, Applicants have amended Claim 26 to specify “**interface software for automatically populating a web page of a web application with data from one or more fields of a selected set of contact data based on mapping data comprising one or more fields of contact data from personal information manager (PIM) software mapped to one or more corresponding fields of the web page of the web application.**” Support for the amendment is found in paragraph [0018] of the specification. Thus, for the reasons explained above in regard to Claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that *Rensin* and *Swan* fail to disclose

or suggest this feature and, accordingly, request that the current rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Independent Claim 50

On Page 5 of the Office Action, independent Claim 50 has been rejected as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in light of *Rensin* in view of *Swan*. Although Applicants do not necessarily agree with the current rejection of Claim 50, in order to facilitate prosecution of the present application, Applicants have amended Claim 50 to further distinguish the claimed invention from the cited prior art. For example, Applicants have amended Claim 50 to specify “**transmitting interface software for automatically populating a web application with data from one or more fields of a selected set of contact data from personal information manager (PIM) software based on mapping data comprising one or more fields of contact data from the PIM software mapped to one or more corresponding fields of a web page of the web application.**” Support for the amendment is found in paragraph [0018] of the specification. Thus, for the reasons explained above in regard to Claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that *Rensin* and *Swan* fail to disclose or suggest this feature and, accordingly, request that the current rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Independent Claim 65

On Page 5 of the Office Action, independent Claim 65 has been rejected as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in light of *Rensin* in view of *Swan*. Although Applicants do not necessarily agree with the current rejection of Claim 65, in order to facilitate prosecution of the present application, Applicants have amended Claim 65 to further distinguish the claimed invention from the cited prior art. For example, Applicants have amended Claim 65 to specify “**a computing device adapted for executing interface software to automatically populate a web page of a web application with data from one or more fields of a selected set of contact data from personal information manager (PIM) software by utilizing mapping data comprising one or more fields of the contact data from the PIM software mapped to one or more corresponding fields of the web page of the web application.**” Support for the amendment is found in paragraph [0018] of the specification. Thus, for the reasons explained above in regard

to Claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that *Rensin* and *Swan* fail to disclose or suggest this feature and, accordingly, request that the current rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Independent Claim 78

On Page 5 of the Office Action, independent Claim 78 has been rejected as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in light of *Rensin* in view of *Swan*. Although Applicants do not necessarily agree with the current rejection of Claim 78, in order to facilitate prosecution of the present application, Applicants have amended Claim 78 to further distinguish the claimed invention from the cited prior art. For example, Applicants have amended Claim 78 to specify a computer device adapted for: (1) “executing the mapping software to map at least one field of contact data from the PIM software to a least one field of a web page of the web application to generate mapping data,” and (2) “executing the interface software to enable the user to select a displayed set of contact data, the computing device mapping the selected set of contact data to at least one field of the web page of the web application based on the mapping data, to automatically populate the at least one field of the web page with the data from one or more fields of the selected set of contact data.” Support for the amendment is found in paragraph [0018] of the specification. Thus, for the reasons explained above in regard to Claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that *Rensin* and *Swan* fail to disclose or suggest these features and, accordingly, request that the current rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Independent Claim 84

On Page 5 of the Office Action, independent Claim 84 has been rejected as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in light of *Rensin* in view of *Swan*. Although Applicants do not necessarily agree with the current rejection of Claim 84, in order to facilitate prosecution of the present application, Applicants have amended Claim 84 to further distinguish the claimed invention from the cited prior art. For example, Applicants have amended Claim 84 to specify a computer-readable medium having a computer program executable by a computer device to “display more than one set of contact data matching the one or more alphanumeric characters for the user to select for automatically populating one or more fields of the web page, the computer program mapping data from one or more fields of the selected contact data from personal

information manager (PIM) software to the one or more corresponding fields of the web page based on mapping data comprising one or more fields of the contact data from the PIM software mapped to one or more corresponding fields of the web page to automatically populate the web page with the selected contact data.” Support for the amendment is found in paragraph [0018] of the specification. Thus, for the reasons explained above in regard to Claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that *Rensin* and *Swan* fail to disclose or suggest this feature and, accordingly, request that the current rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 4, 9-18, 23, 28, 53, 56-64, 68-69, 75-77, 80, 82-83, 87, and 92-101

Claims 4 and 9-18 depend from independent Claim 1 and therefore include all the limitations of Claim 1 plus additional limitations that further define the invention over the prior art. Claim 23 depends from independent Claim 19 and therefore includes all the limitations of Claim 19 plus additional limitations that further define the invention over the prior art. Claim 28 depends from independent Claim 26 and therefore includes all the limitations of Claim 26 plus additional limitations that further define the invention over the prior art. Claims 53 and 56-64 depend from independent Claim 50 and therefore include all the limitations of Claim 50 plus additional limitations that further define the invention over the prior art. Claims 68-69 and 75-77 depend from independent Claim 65 and therefore include all the limitations of Claim 65 plus additional limitations that further define the invention over the prior art. Claims 80 and 82-83 depend from independent Claim 78 and therefore include all the limitations of Claim 78 plus additional limitations that further define the invention over the prior art. Claims 87 and 92-101 depend from independent Claim 84 and therefore include all the limitations of Claim 84 plus additional limitations that further define the invention over the prior art. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above in regard to independent Claims 1, 19, 26, 50, 65, 78, and 84, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are also in condition for allowance.

Appl. No.: 10/607,907
Amdt. dated February 25, 2008
Reply to Office Action of December 20, 2007

CONCLUSION

The foregoing is submitted as a full and complete response to the final Office Action mailed December 20, 2007. The foregoing amendments to the claims, when taken in conjunction with the appended remarks, are believed to have placed the present application in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested. The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at (404) 881-7640 or e-mail at chris.haggerty@alston.com to resolve any remaining issues in order to expedite examination of the present application.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,

/Christopher S. Haggerty/

Christopher S. Haggerty
Registration No. 58,100

Customer No. 00826
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
Bank of America Plaza
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000
Tel Atlanta Office (404) 881-7000
Fax Atlanta Office (404) 881-7777

ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON February 25, 2008.